DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 582 EA 031 139

AUTHOR	Odden, Allan; Archibald, Sarah; Tychsen, Anita
TITLE	Hollister Elementary School: A Case Study of Resource Reallocation.
INSTITUTION	Consortium for Policy Research in Education.; Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.; Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, Madison. National Center for Effective Schools.
PUB DATE	1999-10-25
NOTE	30p.; A version of this paper was prepared for the American Education Finance Association Research Conference (Seattle, WA, March 18-21, 1999).
CONTRACT	R3086A60003
AVAILABLE FROM	Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796. Tel: 608-263-4260; Fax: 608-263-6448.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; *Educational Finance; Elementary Education; *Resource Allocation; School Accounting; School Based Management; *School Funds; School Support

ABSTRACT

Hollister Elementary School was one of several schools in its district to adopt a reform agenda initiated by the new district superintendent in 1995. This report tells the story of the school's adoption, implementation, and funding of the Success for All reading and Math Wings programs. The salient point is that the staff at the school managed to implement one of the most expensive comprehensive school designs with very little additional funding on top of already limited funding. Reform was accomplished because the superintendent set and supported the school on a course for change. He made it clear that to receive Title I funds, schools had to choose a research-based school design that specifically addressed the problems revealed in the needs assessment each school performed. He gave schools in need control over the majority of their school budget. At Hollister, the principal was able to reallocate some resources to the needs of the reform. Funds for former Title I positions allocated by the district plus additional Title I funding allowed payment for the majority of the Success for All and Math Wings programs. Initial student achievement results from both programs are promising. (RT)

ED 455 582

CONSORTIUM FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION
University of Pennsylvania • Harvard University • Stanford University
University of Michigan • University of Wisconsin-Madison

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Archibald

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Hollister Elementary School: A Case Study of Resource Reallocation

Allan Odden, Sarah Archibald, and Anita Tychsen
Consortium for Policy Research in Education
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 W. Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706
(608) 263-4260
http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/cpre

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

October 25, 1999

The original case study of this elementary school is a part of Anita Tychsen's unpublished dissertation. A version of this paper was prepared for the American Education Finance Association Research Conference, March 18-21, 1999 in Seattle, Washington. The research reported in this article was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management to the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison (Grant No. OERI-R3086A60003). The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Institute of Educational Governance, Finance, Policy-Making and Management, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Institutional partners of CPRE, or the Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

UW Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street, Room 653, Madison, WI 53706-1796 • Phone 608.263.4260 • Fax 608.263.6448

EA031139

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Hollister Elementary School is a K-5 school serving approximately 511 children of the enlisted men and women from the military base on which it is located. The student population is approximately 51 percent Caucasian, 30 percent African-American, 10 percent Hispanic, 6 percent Asian, and 3 percent Native American. About 6 percent of the students (31) receive some special education services and about 3 percent (15) receive instruction in ESL. Almost two-thirds of the students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

The school is one of 29 schools in a large suburban district located within 10 miles of a major metropolitan area in the Northwest. This district embarked on an ambitious reform agenda initiated by the superintendent who arrived in the summer of 1995. Convinced that schools could do more for children of poverty, the superintendent was interested in allowing schools where at least 50 percent of the students were eligible for free or reduced lunch to use their Title I funds for schoolwide programs. However, he made that budgetary discretion conditional: It would only be awarded if a school agreed to undertake an intensive self-study of its students' needs. This self-study was to include a review of student test scores and attendance records, meetings with staff regarding the priorities of the school, and surveys of parents on their concerns regarding their child's education. After assessing those needs, the assignment was to outline a plan for using a research-based school design to address those needs. Hollister Elementary School agreed to this condition, and chose the Success For All reading model to combat poor literacy skills among its students.

In time, the district allowed these schools discretion over more than just Title I funds. Two years after adopting a school design, many schools (including Hollister) were granted authority over the majority of their district allocations for staffing salaries. This meant that

instead of receiving district allocations of staffing slots that the individual schools were to fill, the school received the dollar equivalents for those slots to be used for hiring staff and for various other program supports deemed necessary by the school. This devolution of authority to the school site was part of the superintendent's plan to decentralize power from the central office to the school site. He encouraged schools to adopt site-based management and supported them by redefining the role of the central office as a service provided to assist schools, rather than as a top-down bureaucracy.

This case study has three sections. The first section describes the context of the school, outlining the school's new vision of its purpose and detailing the elements of Success For All and its impact on the school program. The second section describes the school's expanded budgetary authority in terms of the district allocations to the school and the staffing choices made by the principal and her staff. The staff before and after the adoption of Success For All is compared as a means of demonstrating the degree to which resource reallocation occurred. Finally, these differences in resource use are summarized.

New School Vision

This section outlines the steps taken by Hollister Elementary School when it chose to adopt Success For All reading in the school. The implementation of the design required changes to the school schedule; the curriculum; the accommodation of special needs students; the professional development program offered to teachers; and the accountability measures that accompany increased budget authority. These subsections highlight the major elements of concern to an educator and are intended to provide a background to the reform initiatives and resource reallocation undertaken at the school.

Adopting a Schoolwide Program

With almost two-thirds of the student body eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, Hollister qualified for participation in the Title I schoolwide program and saw the superintendent's offer as a win-win situation. The needs assessment was a means of prodding them to do what they needed to do in order to improve student achievement, with the added incentive of increased discretion over their school budget. The staff at Hollister spent most of the 1995-96 school year studying data and conducting surveys, as did the other schools eligible for the schoolwide Title I programs. They found data to support anecdotal evidence that the school's test scores in all subjects, including reading, were among the lowest in the district. Teachers decided that their primary curricular concerns were reading, math and technology, and they divided into teams to research programs that specialized in these areas. These teams then made presentations to the staff and parents, where they further prioritized their concerns. That priority matrix was used when choosing from among the finalists presented by the research team: the Comer School Development Program, the Accelerated Schools model and the Success For All reading program [for more information, see the following web sites: info.med.yale.edu/comer/; www.stanford.edu/group/ASP/; www.successforall.com].

Success For All

In the spring of 1996, Hollister staff and parents chose Success For All as its national model because of its emphasis on reading and language skills, its foundation in research, its significant professional development and its extensive ongoing support of program implementation. Success For All (SFA) is a comprehensive school restructuring program developed by Robert Slavin of Johns Hopkins University. The main premise behind the

program is to organize a school's resources to ensure that all students will read by the end of third grade. It is a compilation of best practices in curriculum, pedagogy, and classroom and school organization culled from research (for more, see the Success For All website at http://successforall.com; and Slavin, et al., 1996). Hundreds of schools across the country can attest to the success they have had using the SFA reading program (Slavin, et al., 1996). Success For All requires 90 minutes per day devoted to reading, during which students are grouped according to reading levels rather than by age. That time is spent on phonics, reading comprehension, literary elements and writing, in an effort to encourage language development. It is a highly structured program that must be followed closely in order to achieve significant effects. Student progress is closely monitored through regular assessments every eight weeks, after which the multiage reading groups are reconfigured based on the results of those assessments.

Slavin and his team of designers make various recommendations regarding the staff needed to implement this program. For full implementation of the program and to gain the greatest learning effects, they recommend the following personnel and professional development package, as of 1997:

- A program facilitator. This person serves as an on-site coach to classroom teachers and also supervises the testing program for reading that occurs every eight weeks. If a school adopts the Math Wings program, it is recommended that they hire a 0.5-1.0 facilitator for that program as well.

- Certificated teachers to serve as reading tutors. Tutors work with struggling students on a one-on-one basis or may work with small groups of 2-3 students, helping bring students up to the reading level of their assigned reading group. Some Success For All literature suggests one tutor for every 25 percent increment of students eligible for free or reduced lunch. At Hollister, with almost 66 percent of students eligible, this would suggest 2.5 reading tutors to accommodate the student population. However, Ed Partners, the California-based company that helped Hollister implement the SFA program, suggested one full-time certificated teacher tutor, with support from paraeducators and volunteers, rather than 2.5 teachers.

- Family Support Team. This team of staff members can range from one person at one school to a team of four at another school, which might include the parent liaison, guidance counselor, nurse, vice principal (if any) and facilitator. This person, or team, provides a link between the school and the student's home, encouraging parents to increase their involvement in the school. Members of the family support team may visit children's homes, provide parenting skills workshops, or make recommendations to the parents of struggling students.

- Approximately $50,000 to be used for professional development provided by the SFA organization. This would include training over the summer for teachers and periodic visits by SFA staff to monitor implementation of the program, observe teachers in the classroom, answer questions on-site, and provide workshops on an as-needed basis to the school.

- An additional amount for materials, ranging from $13,000 to $22,000, the former being the cost of all the required materials, and the latter including the cost for the optional materials.

For the greatest effects, Success For All suggests that schools implement the program to the greatest extent suggested, which includes one teacher tutor for every 25 percent of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch plus the instructional facilitator and family liaison. At Hollister, this would entail 4.5 professional staff members (facilitator, family liaison and tutors), approximately $50,000 for professional development activities, and between $13,000 and $22,000 for materials. With a teacher's salary in the district averaging about $53,000, the total amount of money needed to fund this version of SFA at Hollister would be between $302,000 and $311,000. Of course, Slavin and the SFA team recognize that different schools have different needs and different resources with which to implement the program, so they suggest that the core staff needed to implement the program is a program facilitator, a reading tutor and a parent liaison. Using these new positions alone, schools may not see the same results as they would if they had hired the full complement of teacher tutors and other staff, but these three staff members provide a start toward reforming the school and improving student achievement.

Many at Hollister attribute the staff's sense of commitment to the SFA program to the year-long process of self-evaluation and analysis. The identification of needs and the setting of priorities led to a common understanding of the challenges the school faced. The selection by the majority also bound the staff together and seemed to re-energize them and lead them to make a renewed pledge to dedicate their efforts and loyalty to the school. That shared commitment to a common goal became manifest during the SFA training before the start of the 1996 schoolyear. Over the summer, the teacher hired to become the school's designated SFA facilitator went to a week-long session on the particulars of the SFA model while all of the teachers attended a three-day training session before school started. The training included demonstrations of the tightly scheduled reading lessons, with their emphasis on reading comprehension through listening to stories and retelling them; direct instruction, where teachers introduce skills such as identifying main ideas, drawing conclusions and comparing ideas; and various writing activities. In addition, teachers learned more about the structure of the program and its rationale for grouping children. A summary of the organizational details of the SFA model follow below:

- 90 minutes are devoted to reading every day; this time is "sacred" and cannot be used for other purposes.
- There are two main divisions of the program, with a third component called Kinderoots for kindergartners. Reading Roots is for beginning readers, and is a balance between phonics and reading comprehension. Reading Wings is primarily for grades 2-6 and makes use of the school's existing reading curriculum, supplementing the texts with many cooperative learning activities.
- Students are in multiage groups formed according to their reading achievement level; in one reading group there may be first, second and third graders, who are all reading at the same level, so there may be students of two or three grades in a single reading class.
- Students are evaluated every 8 weeks and reassigned to reading groups accordingly.

- Students who are struggling with reading meet one-on-one with a reading tutor for a 20 minute period each day until they reach the competency level of their assigned reading group. Priority for tutoring is given to first graders, with up to 30 percent of first graders being tutored in any given week. Next in line are the second graders, with up to 20 percent of students at that level being tutored. From the third grade, up to 10 percent of students are being tutored in any given week of the school year.

- Reading groups are relatively small: Slavin estimates that they will comprise about 20 students. (As will be discussed later, reading groups at Hollister were even smaller, averaging approximately 16 students.)

The choice of Success For All must be approved by at least 80 percent of the staff before the SFA organization agrees to the contract. At Hollister, 94 percent of the staff voted for the program; only one teacher disagreed with the decision to adopt the model from the outset. However, a few teachers left the school because they objected to the prescriptive nature of SFA or felt that their teaching style did not match the SFA model. Those who left Hollister were reassigned to other schools within the district; no one who objected to the adoption of SFA forfeited their position in the district. Nevertheless, most of the teachers at the school stayed. In fact, the SFA facilitator is a former reading teacher at the school and has worked at Hollister for several years. When the school recently adopted the Math Wings curriculum, the principal hired a veteran staff member as the facilitator for that program as well. The teachers who replaced those who left all came from other schools within the district.

Schedule

Hollister uses the following schedule:

8:00	School doors open
8:10	Students arrive at school
8:20-9:55	90 minutes devoted to the SFA reading program

9:55-10:15	20 minutes of recess for grades K-3; this time is used as preparation time by some teachers
10:15-11:15/11:30	60-75 minutes of math, depending on the grade level
11:30-2:45	Various instructional blocks and a 30 minute lunch break
2:50	The school day is over; students leave school

In this schedule, teachers have 30 minutes before and after school for preparation. There is an additional 50 minutes preparation time scheduled during the school day but this time is usually not consecutive; it is comprised of a combination of the children's 20 minute recess and the particular 30 minute special subject (art, music or physical education) that they have scheduled on any given day. But these two planning periods are not often scheduled back-to-back, which makes them fragmented and less useful for meeting with other teachers or getting a lot of planning done. Research has shown that such common, consecutive planning periods can help facilitate school restructuring and curriculum improvement (Newmann and Associates, 1997). So, while it's true that Hollister teachers have 110 minutes per day, or 550 minutes per week, of scheduled, contracted preparation time, they still do not have as much uninterrupted planning time as they could use.

Curriculum

As has been mentioned, Hollister adopted the SFA reading program in the fall of 1996. The 90 minutes devoted daily to the SFA curriculum include reading, writing and listening comprehension activities. The reading component is comprised of reading aloud, retelling the story to partners, learning new vocabulary, and spelling. The writing component includes strategies for planning a story, writing drafts, sharing their writing with partners, and revising their work based on others' input. Reading and listening comprehension comprises

such skills as identifying main ideas, drawing conclusions and comparing and contrasting ideas (for more, see Slavin, et al., 1996). Literacy is definitely of utmost concern at the school and has been the focus of staff attention for the past few years.

However, that focus was expanded in the fall of 1997, when money became available for the staff to address its concern over math achievement at the school. This had been an issue raised during the self-study and was raised again when the results of the math portion of the state achievement tests showed that fourth graders had scored below the fourth percentile in the spring of 1997. The staff was so pleased with the results from the SFA reading program that they decided to incorporate another Johns Hopkins curriculum program into the school the following year. The Math Wings program is based on the standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. It emphasizes learning the basics by solving problems, working in cooperative groups, and using real-life situations to help the students relate to the lessons. There is also a priority set on writing and making connections to other subjects, as well as developing facility with a calculator (Slavin, et al., 1996). Math Wings is overseen by a half-time (0.5) facilitator, in addition to the full-time reading facilitator, which is within the guidelines of 0.5-1.0 FTE for a facilitator recommended by Robert Slavin. Although 1998-99 was the first year of Math Wings, math test results had already increased by the beginning of the same school year, most likely due to increased reading ability. The staff is hopeful that the scores will improve at an even faster rate now that the math program is in place.

The social studies program is taught using the Harcourt Brace Jovanovich series for elementary schools, grades 1-5 [see www.hbschool.com]. The science program was developed by the district and is made up of a series of curriculum packets.

In addition to the core subjects, specialist classes are also part of the school curriculum. There is a physical education teacher, an integrated arts teacher responsible for a program featuring both music and drawing, and there is a librarian on staff. These teachers provide preparation times for the regular classroom teachers as well as supplementing the curriculum, and they also take part in the SFA reading program by teaching reading groups.

Students with Special Needs

Students with severe disabilities are not taught at Hollister but are sent to other schools in the district designated for that purpose. However, children with mild disabilities remain at Hollister and there is a resource teacher who works with the 30-35 special education students at the school. The school operates what it calls a resource-inclusion program whereby special education students are kept in the regular education classroom as much as possible but they may be sent to the special education resource room on an as-needed basis. The resource teacher teaches a Roots reading group, which is comprised of children at the lowest reading level, many of whom have mild learning difficulties, and she also teaches a math class for those students struggling in their Math Wings classes. There is also an ESL paraprofessional at the school to work with the 15-20 students who need help learning the English language. She works with the ESL students in the regular classroom as an additional resource. She also teaches a reading group that includes, but is not limited to, 6-7 ESL students. In these ways, special needs children are integrated into the SFA reading program, with the special education teacher and ESL teacher both teaching reading groups (using the same curriculum as the other students use) for those students who are most in need of additional attention. (It should be noted that Individual Education Plans (IEPs) for those students formerly served outside the regular classroom were rewritten to reflect this new method of meeting student needs.)

Professional Development

Professional development is provided primarily through the contract with Success For All. This includes the initial weeklong training for the SFA facilitator for the school and the three days of training for teachers on the material and methods of the SFA reading program before school began. In addition, SFA representatives evaluate teachers three times per year. During these two-day visits, all teachers are observed and all have individual conferences with the evaluators. During these conferences, concerns regarding the curriculum and teaching strategies may be addressed.

Of course, there also is the on-site resource of the SFA facilitator and the Math Wings facilitator themselves. In addition to coordinating their respective programs and the SFA facilitator's additional duties of monitoring the testing held every eight weeks and using those results to reconfigure the reading groups, the facilitators serve as coaches who are available for consultations. Whenever there is a question, the individual teacher can consult with a colleague close at hand regarding how best to tackle a particular issue. The facilitators are also available to model teaching strategies and the general flow of a lesson, and the principal might even take a class to allow one teacher to observe the facilitator or another teacher. In addition, the facilitators meet with teachers in small groups to discuss common concerns, and those meetings help underscore the feeling that the staff is part of the common enterprise of working to improve student achievement.

In this school district there are five half-days in the school calendar devoted to professional development, all used by schools for school-specific training. During the 1998-99 school year, three of the five half days at Hollister were devoted to training for the Math Wings program. Some additional professional development time was used to train staff on

how to use a new email system as a communication tool. The remaining time was used for a workshop on cooperative learning and for some work on curriculum by the grade-level teams at the school. In short, nearly all staff development focused on school goals and programs.

Measuring Results and Accountability

There are three main tests used to measure results and to hold schools accountable for student achievement. Beginning with the 1998-99 school year, the state mandated that the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) be given to all children in the third and eighth grade, dropping the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), which had been in place for several years. In addition, the state requires students to take a second test, the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), that has been developed by the state education agency. This state test emphasizes problem-solving, writing, and the explanation of one's work, and can be thought of as more of a performance based assessment rather than a more traditional, multiple-choice test. The state phased in this second test during the 1996-97 school year.

To supplement the ITBS and the state tests, the district developed a criterion reference test to monitor how well students were learning the district's curriculum. As a lucky happenstance, this test draws heavily from the ITBS, which the state adopted a few months after the district developed its own test. As a result, the district test is closely aligned with the state-written achievement test. The district test is supplemented by questions pertaining to the district curriculum as well as some extended answer questions. Last year, in the spring of 1998, it was given to students in the 5th and 8th grades. In one sense, this test is an accountability tool, for it is a measure of how well the school is teaching the district curriculum. If the students perform well, the school staff is doing the right thing; if the

students do not perform well, the central office will be taking a closer look at the principal's work and the school plan, working with the school to improve its performance.

In addition to the three achievement tests administered at all the schools in the district, Hollister uses the Gates pre- and post-tests to further evaluate the reading and writing abilities of all of the first, second and third graders in the school. This test is administered by outside consultants who come to the school site and test students one-on-one twice a year.

This comprehensive testing program is in place to monitor and help ensure high student achievement, and results are mixed on this front. In the 1996-97 school year, the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) scores were at 33 percent for reading and 27 percent for math. The following year, in 1997-98, they rose to 46 percent in reading and 51 percent in math. These tests were administered to fourth graders in October through the 1997-98 school year, but in 1998-99 the CTBS was not administered. Instead, the third graders were given the ITBS in April, and their scores were 49 percent for reading and 49 percent for math. In April of 1997, the reading score was 33.3 percent and the math score was less than 4 percent (3.9 percent). The next year, in April of 1998, the reading score increased to 43.3 percent and the math score rose to 15.2 percent. In 1999, the reading score dropped a bit to 39.7, and the math score fell slightly to 13.4. These test scores are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Reading and math test scores of 4th graders at Hollister Elementary School (in percentages)

Test	Date	Reading	Math
CTBS	October 1996	33	27
	October 1997	46	51
State Test	April 1997	33.3 (47.6)*	3.9 (21.5)*
	April 1998	43.3	15.2
	April 1999	39.7	13.4

* indicates statewide average

While these scores have not yet reached the statewide averages of 48 percent in reading and 22 percent in math, they have increased significantly. The principal credits the SFA reading program and the Math Wings program with having "made all the difference in the world." She describes parents as being excited about the program as well, with 60-70 percent of all students' homes having committed to listening to their children read 20 minutes per night. Credit must also be given to the great number of outreach programs targeted toward reading at home and general academic performance. Without the commitment of the staff to these initiatives, the principal and staff are convinced that the school would not have seen such improvement.

Budgeting and Staffing

After gaining discretion over its Title I money and making decisions regarding the allocation of that money for two years, Hollister has recently gained control over the majority of its budget. The central office began a phase-in program a couple of years ago whereby it devolved slightly more than 60 percent of a school's operating budget to the school itself, including funds for instruction, school administration, classified staff, supplies, materials, equipment and categorical programs. Those funds not devolved to the school site include maintenance, transportation, capital projects, debt service and district operations. The 1998-99 school year was the first year Hollister was included in the project and it is adjusting to the responsibility and paperwork attending the large increase in its budget authority. This section describes how the district allocates money to Hollister and the staffing choices that have been made to support the school program. Then, the staff before and after the adoption of Success For All is compared as a means of illustrating the degree to which resource reallocation has occurred. Finally, these differences in staff and resource use are summarized.

District Allocations

The district uses a needs-based, weighted pupil funding formula to determine each school's discretionary budget (Ross and Levacic, 1999). The formula is based on an average per pupil amount of $3,745 for students in grades 1-5. That amount is assigned to each student with average educational needs and is given a weight of 1.0; the weights of students with additional needs are adjusted accordingly. For example, kindergarten students are weighted at 0.5 because they attend school for only a half day, and they are funded at 0.5 x $3,745 = $1,872. Special education students are weighted at 1.5 and are funded at 1.5 x $3,745 = $5,618. ESL students are weighted at 1.2 and are funded at 1.2 x $3,745 = $4,494. All children eligible for Title I funds are provided an additional $620, which can be converted to a weight of 0.166. A table summarizing these weights and allocations follows.

Table 2: District allocation of funds to Hollister Elementary School, 1998-99 schoolyear

Student	Funding Source	Weight	# of students	Calculation of total amount
Kindergarten	Local	0.5	90	0.5 x 90 x $3,745 = $168,507
Grades 1-5	Local	1.0	429	1.0 x 429 x $3,745 = $1,606,429
Special Education	Comb.*	0.5	23	0.5 x 23 x $3,745 = $43,063
ESL	Local, State	0.2	14	0.2 x 14 x $3,745 = $10,485
Title I Schoolwide	Federal	0.166	334	334 x $620 = $207,080
			Sub-Total	$2,035,397
Adjustment to District Allocation				($187,455)
			TOTAL	**$1,847,942**

*Combination refers to a combination of local, state and federal funding sources that pay for delivery of services to special needs students.

The "Adjustment to District Allocation" was a correction factor in the allocation formula that was used to take money from larger schools and redistribute it to smaller schools (of less than 400 students) that experience diseconomies of scale. The adjustment worked by subtracting

400 from the projected enrollment of full-time students for the 1998-99 schoolyear, which was 474 for Hollister: (474-400) x $2,533 = $187,455. However, the superintendent concluded that this piece of the allocation formula did not work well and changed its entire allocation method, including its way of funding smaller schools, to avoid this problem in 1999-2000 and beyond.

In addition to the district allocation, other district and state funds were allocated to the school on a per-pupil basis. For example, the state provided grants for professional development activities as well as for various school supplies. The district distributed monies that were raised from various tax levies within the district. In this particular state, school districts may levy taxes to raise money for specific purposes. In the Cordell Place school district for the 1998-99 school year, there were three district levies in place. One levy raised money for library books and materials, a second raised money for school furniture, and a third raised money that could be spent at the discretion of the school. The table that follows details the per pupil amounts associated with these state and district funds. Please note that the number of pupils used to calculate the allocations for the school is 474. That is the total number of children in grades 1-5 (429) plus half the number of children in kindergarten (90/2 = 45). Those grants and levies totaled just over $50,000, which brought Hollister's budget to $1,898,446. This total is supplemented further by some additional grants that will be described later.

Table 3: Details of state and district per pupil allocations in Cordell Place school district

Funding source	Per Pupil Amount (in $)	Total Amount (in $)
State grant for PD	30.70	14,552
State grant for supplies	20.82	9,869
Local levy for library	9.83	4,659
Local levy for furniture	9.02	4,275

Local levy for school	36.18	17,149
	Sub-TOTAL	**50,504**
	District Allocation Total	**1,847,942**
	GRAND TOTAL	**1,898,446**

Following the Money Trail

The discussion will now turn to how Hollister Elementary School chose to use its money. It is important to remember that the 1998-99 school year was the first year that the school has had authority over the majority of its budget. During the previous two years, the school had control over only its Title I money. This assumption of control over the majority of its budget has been a somewhat daunting task that will be described later. Table 4 details Hollister's budget by function and funding source.

Table 4: Budget by function and source at Hollister Elementary School, 1998-99

Budget Item	**Funding Source**	**Amount (in dollars)**
Classroom Staff plus others		**1,562,805**
Salaries and benefits for 1 principal,19 classroom teachers, 2.0 specials teachers, 0.22 Gifted and Talented, 1.0 librarian, clerical staff, Paraeducators, Custodians	Local Allocation	1,561,107
Paraeducators (0.58 hours)	Local District Levy	1,698
Professional Development		**56,422**
Various Professional Development Activities	State Professional Development Grant	14,553
SFA Contract	Federal Title I	12,000
Math Wings Contract	Federal Title I	29,869
SFA Program		**174,768**
1.0 SFA Facilitator	Federal Title I	53,068
1.0 Reading Tutor	Federal Title I	53,068
4 Paraeducators (13.0 hours/day)	Federal Title I/Reading Grant Funds	45,463
Substitutes, Supplies, Testing materials, Travel, etc.	Federal Title I/Reading Grant Funds	23,169

Math Wings Program		**60,749**
0.5 Math Wings Facilitator	Federal Title I	26,534
Instructional Materials	Federal Title I	34,215
Special Education		**80,267**
1.0 Special Education Teacher	Local Allocation	53,068
0.5 Special Education Teacher	Local Allocation	26,534
Substitutes, Supplies, FICA, etc.	Local Allocation	665
ESL		
Paraeducator (3.25 hours), Supplies		
	State Allocation – ESL	10,485
Miscellaneous		
Site Counsel Initiative		
Equipment	District Levy	15,291
Library books and material	District Levy	4,275
Various supplies	District Levy	4,659
	State Allocation for School Supplies	9,869
70,747 (Title I) + 10,669 (Special Education) = 81,143	**District Allocation Total**	**1,898,447**
	Overbudget/Shortfall	**80,975**
	Additional Grants	75,000
	Additional Savings	6,143
	TOTAL BUDGET	**1,979,590**

All of the regular classroom teachers, specials teachers, principal, librarian, clerical staff and custodians were paid for with the general district allocation, staffed at the same level as they had been before Hollister gained control over its budget. The SFA reading and Math Wings programs were supported largely with the $207,080 in Title I funds, but the remaining costs of the program, $70,306, were paid for with state reading grants. As Table 4 illustrates, Hollister spent $80,975 more than their district allocation in 1998-99. The majority of that money was spent on the SFA program, and the remainder – $10,669 – was spent on special education programs. The shortfall was made up using two grants totaling approximately $75,000 to be used to encourage and improve reading. This grant money was used to support the SFA reading program, and some money was shifted to support the special education

program area. The principal believed the remainder of the shortfall, $5,975, could be covered with savings from substitute days allotted to the school and from any leftover dollars budgeted for materials.

It is instructive to examine the costs of the SFA reading and Math Wings programs as implemented at the school and the funding sources used to cover those costs. In doing so, it is possible to consider the feasibility and desirability of some decisions (such as hiring additional teacher tutors) other than those made at Hollister. In terms of staff positions supporting the programs, Hollister hired a 1.0 SFA facilitator, a 0.5 Math Wings facilitator, a 1.0 certificated teacher as a reading tutor, and maintained a 1.0 counselor as a family liaison. The facilitators and reading tutor are paid for using Title I funds, and the family liaison/counselor's salary is paid for using the local district allocation. At an average salary of $53,068, the additional 2.5 positions use approximately $132,670 of the Title I funds. Hollister spends another $41,000 of its Title I money for design-based professional development, $12,000 for SFA and 29,000 for Math Wings; an additional $14,553 for design-based professional development is paid for with a state grant. The total spent on professional development is $56,422. These staff and professional development costs total $173,670 in Title I money alone, with $33,410 remaining. $45,463 is used to pay for 65 hours of paraeducator time per week, used for SFA tutoring, and $23,169 is used for other SFA-related items, including testing materials, travel time to SFA-related conferences, substitutes to cover teacher absences, etc. An additional $34,215 of Title I funds are spent on instructional materials for the Math Wings program. These three budget items total $102,847, exceeding the $33,410 that remains in Title I funds. As has been explained, this shortfall is made up using various grants and small cost-saving measures.

Because the school lacks the funds to hire 1.5 additional teacher tutors, they have chosen to substitute paraeducators who are trained in tutoring by SFA consultants or the SFA facilitator. Paraeducators cost less; because the school can afford 65 hours of paraeducator time with the same amount of money that would buy only 34 hours from a teacher tutor, more students can be tutored for the same amount of money. However, it should be noted that some studies have shown that paraeducators are not as effective as reading teachers in the role of tutor (Shanahan, 1998). While training paraeducators as tutors can improve their ability to help students with reading, it remains to be seen whether the tradeoff made at Hollister – more time from less-trained tutors rather than less time from a highly trained tutor – will pay off in terms of raising student achievement.

Reviewing the expenses associated with the schoolwide programs, implementation of the SFA program (including the additional 1.5 teacher tutors) should cost approximately $302,000. However, because the school fulfills the design requirement of a family liaison with a guidance counselor allocation from the district, we can subtract $53,068 to arrive at a cost of $248,738 for the SFA program alone. When you add a 0.5 FTE Math Wings facilitator and $64,084 for Math Wings materials and professional development (at least for the first year), this would bring the total up to $339,356 for both programs, including the additional 1.5 teacher tutors. Hollister receives $207,080 in Title I plus approximately $75,000 in grant money, for a total of $282,080. With a difference of more than $57,276, Hollister cannot afford those additional teacher tutors using only Title I funds and grant money. However, over time, the principal and staff may decide to shift some resources and make some difficult choices in order to find the money necessary to execute these programs to the maximal degree suggested by their designers.

The discussion has focussed on budget details and has described how Hollister has tried to accommodate the requirements of the SFA reading and math programs. Staffing changes have been briefly touched upon, and are implied in the discussion of resource use. Now, however, the discussion will turn to a specific analysis of the allocation of personnel that resulted from the adoption of the SFA model, highlighting the differences between the district's staffing suggestions and the actual staffing decisions made at Hollister to support its programs. Table 5 summarizes these staffing differences.

Table 5: Comparison of district and actual school allocation at Hollister, 1998-99

Position	District Suggestion	Hollister Decision	Difference
Classroom Teachers	19.0	19.0	
Title I Specialist*	2.0	0.0	-2.0
SFA Facilitator	0.0	1.0	+1.0
Math Wings Facilitator	0.0	0.5	+0.5
Reading Tutor	0.0	1.0	+1.0
Regular Ed. Specialists			
Integrated Arts	1.0	1.0	
Physical Education	1.0	1.0	
Special Needs			
Special Education	1.0	1.5	+0.5
Gifted & Talented	0.22	0.22	
Additional staff			
Librarian	1.0	1.0	
Nurse	0.10	0.08	-0.02
Counselor/Family Liaison	1.0	1.0	
Principal	1.0	1.0	
		Total Difference	**+.98 FTE**
	In hours/day	**In hours/day**	**In hours/day**
Clerical Support	11.0	16.9	+5.9
Paraeducators**	15.0	34.1	+19.1
Custodial Staff	16.0	16.0	
Food Service	12.5	12.5	

ESL Paraeducator	3.25	3.5	+0.25
LPN	3.0	0.0	-3.0
Lunch Room Supervisor	4.0	3.0	-1.0
		Total Difference	**+21.25/day**

*The district still calls this allocation "Title I specialist" although it is understood that there no longer is such a position in the district. Instead, schools are to use this allocation to support their particular design model.

**Paraeducators perform various functions such as supervise the cafeteria and the playground, work with ESL students, help tutor students in reading, and provide one-on-one attention to some of the many children with special needs who attend the school.

While the school has discretion over much of its budget, the district does provide a sample resource allocation form that can be useful during the first year of budgetary independence. For example, the district uses a formula of allocating one teacher for every 24.5 students. Since there are no class size maximums in the district, this formula is merely a tool to determine the number of regular classroom teachers that might be used at the school, given the base budget the district provides. At Hollister, the district suggested that 19.0 teachers be allotted to the school based on its enrollment of 474. Since the SFA program does not require reduced class sizes all day, but rather only for the 90-minute block dedicated to reading, the school did not need to hire more than the district-suggested 19 classroom teachers. Instead, to reduce class size for reading, every teacher in the school teaches a reading group, from the regular classroom teachers to the librarian, the physical education teacher, and the integrated arts teacher. The reading tutor, who is a certificated teacher and supervises all reading tutors, also teaches a reading group. One resource room teacher supervises a resource room and teaches a reading group as well as a math group. There is even an ESL paraprofessional who leads a reading group that includes 6-7 ESL students. This widespread participation in SFA reading allows each student to be in a smaller reading class of approximately 16 students per teacher for at least 90 minutes per day.

When other district allocations are compared with the school allocations, the school's digressions from the district's recommendations highlight the school's decisions and priorities. For example, the district suggested 2.0 Title I specialists for the school, but this is somewhat misleading. When the district decided to begin the schoolwide Title I program whereby schools could gain control over their Title I budgets, it decreed that there would no longer be any Title I teachers in the district. Instead, Title I funds would be allocated to the school and were to be used for other staff. This change in the central office's distribution of Title I funds was a windfall for the school, because it received far more money based on the number of students eligible for free or reduced lunch than it had under the old distribution method of allocating Title I teacher positions to schools. Before, Hollister had received 2.0 Title I teachers slots. Currently, Hollister has enough money in Title I funds to pay for 2.5 staff: the 1.0 SFA facilitator, the 1.0 reading tutor and the 0.5 Math Wings facilitator, as well as 17 hours of aide time and 1 hour for library. Another example of the school using its discretion to deviate from the district's recommendations is evident in the area of clerical support. The district suggested a clerical staff of one full-time secretary plus three hours of additional clerical help. However, the school has chosen to increase that clerical support by 2.5 hours per day to help with the additional paperwork accompanying site-based budgeting. Other decisions that deviate from the district allocation include an additional 3.0 hours for a health paraprofessional, and the decision not to use the 1.0 hour per day for a paraprofessional to work in the library.

These decisions to exceed the district's suggestions mean that Hollister has overspent its standard budget in some areas, which must be paid for by savings in other areas. Some savings are gained by reducing the time of its costly, professional nursing staff and increasing

the less expensive time of a health paraprofessional. About $5,000 ($5,307) of the budget shortfall is recouped by choosing to not use its 0.1 allocation for a school nurse and using that money to help pay for its other reallocation decisions. Another moneysaving strategy is to forgo the 3.0 hours per day of the time of a licensed practical nurse and depend on school staff to cope with minor medical emergencies. The remainder of the deficit is made up by using some Title I money as well as some of the grant money awarded outside of the district budget. The freedom to use the Title I money almost anywhere in the budget allows for this shift in funds.

As you can see from the staffing chart, the number of total staff positions has remained virtually the same, and many of the staff members themselves stayed after the adoption of SFA and Math Wings. The SFA facilitator had been on staff as a reading teacher, so she was familiar; the reading tutor had also been on staff, as a second grade teacher. The Math Wings facilitator had been the arts teacher and still teaches art on a half-time basis, with another arts teacher filling the rest of the 1.0 integrated arts position. The changes in staff include one more 1.0 FTE staff position and a bit less time for the school nurse, about 25 more hours of time for clerical help and for aides, and about 4 hours total less time for a licensed practical nurse and for a lunch room supervisor.

Another staffing change mentioned by the principal was the central office directive to no longer employ regular education paraprofessionals. Apparently the number of students in the district had decreased and each school was informed that it would lose some money. The district decided to make up for the shortfall by no longer allocating hours for paraprofessionals serving particular functions. Without those funds, the staff had to scramble for supervision of the playground and cafeteria. While they have paid for extra time from

some paraprofessionals to fulfill those duties, there is now no one "to do the little things" such as distribute the mail, unpack textbooks, help put textbooks away [principal]. The principal and office staff take on many of these tasks because there simply is no one else to do it, and this lengthens their days considerably.

The assumption of control over much of the budget has necessitated an increase in the number of hours of the clerical staff at the school. Three additional hours per day are split between two secretaries and that time is used for the paperwork which has increased since the school now controls its own budget and makes its own purchases.

Initially, managing the budget led to frustration over the printouts and the actual tracking of the numbers. The clerical person primarily responsible for inputting budget data expressed dissatisfaction over how difficult the budget reports are to use, saying "They're hard to read, it's hard to track where the money goes, program numbers [used to track money] are mixed up throughout the report." All of these difficulties necessitated many staff hours devoted to putting the budget numbers in a format that the school can use. However, for the 1999-2000 school year, the budget documents that the school received were dramatically improved. They were easier to read, contained all the information the school needed, and arrived on the 15th of every month so that the school always has an updated version of its budget.

Conclusion

While the purpose of this case study was to tell the story of Hollister's adoption, implementation and funding of the Success For All reading and Math Wings programs, it is important not to get so mired in the details that the main point gets lost: The staff at Hollister Elementary School, a school with a very limited amount of funding, managed to implement

one of the most expensive comprehensive school designs with very little additional funding. They were able to accomplish this because of three main factors.

First, the superintendent who arrived in the district in 1995 set the school on a course for change. He made the decision that the Title I specialists would no longer be allocated to the school sites; that instead, in exchange for undertaking a yearlong needs assessment, schools would be given those funds in a lump sum. He made it clear that in order to receive those funds, schools had to choose a research-based school design that specifically addressed the problems revealed in the needs assessment that each school performed. At Hollister, the needs assessment revealed unacceptably low reading scores, and the staff decided that Success For All would be the best program to improve the students' lagging reading scores.

Second, the superintendent gave the schools who met the conditions outlined above control over the majority of their school's budget. Having this authority gave schools the ability to use their school's resources to implement the school design that they had selected to address the school's needs, and Hollister had the good fortune of having a principal who was willing and able to take on this task. Through careful consideration of the allocation of its resources, the principal was able to reallocate some resources to the needs of the SFA program. In addition, the principal was able to secure a $75,000 reading grant that enabled her to reallocate an even greater amount of existing school resources to other purposes.

The last and arguably most significant factor in enabling Hollister to adopt Success For All was its ability to apply Title I money to schoolwide programs. The combination of the funds for the former Title I positions allocated by the district and the additional Title I funds paid for the majority of the SFA reading and Math Wings programs. With its inclusive method of reading instruction, students who were formerly served outside the classroom are

now served in regular classrooms, in groups of approximately 16 for reading. Because of this, the former Title I remedial reading teachers were no longer needed at the school, and the ability to apply those funds for schoolwide purposes made it possible to allocate those funds to SFA. The additional Title I funds helped pay for many important elements of the program, including extensive professional development and materials. That funding also made it possible for the school to fund the Math Wings program, thereby addressing the low math scores that were also revealed by the needs assessment.

In short, the impetus for change – a superintendent who demanded that his schools undergo data-driven needs assessments – led to Hollister's decision to adopt the Success For All reading program (and eventually Math Wings as well). School-based budgetary authority gave the principal the opportunity to reallocate the school's resources, and Title I funds helped the school afford the costs of a very expensive school design. Initial student achievement results from both programs are promising, and the staff hopes to see continued improvement as they maintain their concentrated allocation of resources to these programs.

References

Newmann, Fred, & Associates. (1996). Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, K. and Levacic, R., Eds. (1999). *Needs Based Resource Allocation in Education via Formula Funding of Schools*. Paris, International Institute of Educational Planning.

Shanahan, Timothy. (1998). On the Effectiveness and Limitations of Tutoring in Reading. In Review of Research in Education, vol. 23, pp. 217-234. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Dolan, L.J. & Wasik, B.A. (1996). Every Child Every School. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.